

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/270,780	HIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Qi	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mike Qi. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Hung H Bui. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Background information as shown in FIGs. 32-39 of Applicant's specification and Gunjima, US Pat. No. 5,587,816.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Mike Qi.
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative explained the background information and how such information does not qualify as prior art, the features of Applicant's claimed invention and how the background art and Gunjima '816 fail to disclose the features of Applicant's independent claims 1, 13 and 20, including "a reflective polarizer arranged at an upper portion of the light control element so that a polarized light transmission axis of the reflective polarizer is adjusted so as to be substantially perpendicular or substantially parallel to a control axis of the light control element" and that "the light control element is the only light control element arranged between the illumination device and the reflective polarizer". Examiner agreed that the applied prior art, including Gunjima '816 does not disclose the above features of Applicant's claims 1, 13 and 20, and will issue another Office communication soon. However, an updated search will be necessary before any communication will be issued accordingly. Applicant needs not file a statement of substance or other papers.

